

Remarks

In the present response, claims 1-3, 5-14, and 17-20 are presented for examination.

Applicants make a sincere effort to place this application in condition for allowance.

Claim Amendments

Applicants thank the Examiner for noticing the typographical errors in claims 1 and 3 regarding “table.” Claims 1, 3, and 12 are amended to change “table” to “tablet.”

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 8-14, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 7,091,959 (Clary) in view of USPN 6,738,053 (Borgstrom) and USPN 6,002,853 (deHond). These rejections are traversed.

Claims 1-3, 8-14, and 17-20 recite one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in Clary in view of Borgstrom and deHond. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art. Some examples are provided below for the independent claims.

Claim 1

As one example, claim 1 recites an electronic tablet having a screen with plural predefined regions that receive handwritten mnemonic symbols at random locations on the electronic tablet. The handwritten mnemonic symbols are hints for different Internet data addresses. The art of record does not teach these claim elements.

Clary actually teaches away from this recitation. As shown in Fig. 3 of Clary, the user enters the email address at predefined locations on the predefined form. Similarly, Bergstrom teaches that the user must enter the URL (example, writing “YAHOO”) in a predefined area. The user then activates a “Connect” command area to navigate to the web page.

Thus, the combination of Clary and Bergstrom teaches writing a URL in a specific designated area and then touching a connect command area to navigate to the URL. By contrast, claim 1 recites plural predefined regions that receive handwritten mnemonic symbols at random locations on the electronic tablet.

deHond fails to cure the deficiencies of Bergstrom and Clary. Furthermore, the examiner admits that “the prior art of record do not teach where the first handwritten mnemonic symbol is being on a first random location on said writing tablet...” (see OA mailed 12/15/2008 at p. 6).

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the art of record.

Claim 8

As one example, claim 8 recites writing a mnemonic object at a random location on a computer writing tablet. The random location on the computer writing tablet of the mnemonic object becomes an index of an Internet address and the random location is coupled to a current one of said Internet-associated computer data addresses. As explained above in connection with claim 1, the art of record teaches writing a URL in a specific designated area and then touching a connect command area to navigate to the URL.

Claim 11

As one example, claim 11 recites receiving a handwritten symbol for the internet site at a random location on a screen of a computer writing tablet that is separate from the electronic device, and creating an index of a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the internet site from geometric coordinates of the handwritten symbol at the random location on the screen. As explained above in connection with claim 1, the art of record teaches writing a URL in a specific designated area and then touching a connect command area to navigate to the URL.

Claim 17

As one example, claim 17 recites that each of the bookmarks is a handwritten mnemonic hint at a random location on a screen of the writing digitizer tablet. As explained above in connection with claim 1, the art of record teaches writing a URL in a specific designated area and then touching a connect command area to navigate to the URL.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant believes all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529